

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 9 and 11-15 are pending, Claim 9 having been amended by way of the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action Claims 9 and 11-15 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawamura (EP 0 835 029) in view of Inoue et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,826,168, hereinafter “Inoue”).

Claim 9 has been amended, consistent with the specification, for example at page 4, lines 18-21 and lines 26-33. Therefore no new matter is added.

By way of non-limiting example as described in the specification at page 4, lines 18-33, a service information control unit derives service information from a transport stream and distributes the service information to output devices connected to the tuning device. These features enable output devices connected to the tuning device with life service information (i.e., with service information of the currently received service which gets converted into a transport stream). Thus, the output devices get supplied with the same information as with currently available tuning devices so that complete service information may be derived and distributed to the output devices.

The outstanding Office Action asserts Kawamura for the feature of deriving the service information. While the Office Action is not entirely clear on this point, the undersigned has construed the “connection acceptance response” shown in Figures 7B or 7F to include information about the channel and program, for example, the last two boxes of Figure 7F. It is believed that the Office is construing these two boxes as some sort of service information derived from the transport stream. Presuming the undersigned properly understands how the reference is being applied, it should be clear that such channel and/or

program information is not complete service information from the transport stream. Since neither Kawamura nor Inoue teach or suggest this feature, it is believed that amended Claim 9 patentably defines over the asserted prior art. Because Claims 11-15 depend from Claim 9, it is respectfully submitted that these claims also patentable define over the asserted prior art for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 9 and 11-15, as amended, is patentably distinguishing over the prior art. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 03/06)